

INTELLECTUALS AND CHURCH FATHERS IN THE THIRD AND FOURTH CENTURIES

Christoph Marksches

When using the term *intellectuals* to describe figures in the history of Christian theology, we are applying — at least implicitly — a concept adopted from Max Weber, as has been shown again by Hans Georg Kippenberg.¹ Weber was probably the first person who ascribed a central role in the formation of the Christian religion to the social stratum of the ‘intellectuals’ and thereby used that comparatively new term. It had been coined in France, probably only in the late nineteenth century, and for a long time was used only in a pejorative sense.² Terms such as *asceticism* and *flight from reality* suggest that Weber also ascribed a very specific function to the intellectuals within the formation of what he called ‘religions of redemption’.³ However, I would like to avoid all these specific connotations today and simply define an intellectual as a learned person according to ancient standards, and as someone trying to follow his faith by reason. It hardly needs to be said that in ancient Palestine such a way of life implied in most cases a very good knowledge of Greek, and this is one of the reasons why the number of such ‘intellectuals’, in proportion to the total population, was lower there than, for example, in Italy.⁴

¹ H. G. Kippenberg, ‘Intellektuellen-Religion’, in *Die Religion von Oberschichten: Religion — Profession — Intellektualismus*, ed. by P. Antes and D. Panke, Veröffentlichungen der Jahrestagung der Deutschen Vereinigung für Religionsgeschichte, 19 (Marburg, 1989), pp. 181–201.

² D. Bering, *Die Intellektuellen: Geschichte eines Schimpfwortes*, Ullstein-Buch, 39031 (Frankfurt, 1982), pp. 32–67.

³ For details see Kippenberg, pp. 193–99.

⁴ Cf. S. Lieberman, ‘How Much Greek in Jewish Palestine?’ in *Biblical and Other Studies*,

When examining the intellectuals in the history of ancient Christian theology in Palestine, we are interested in a specific phenomenon of Christianity's inculturation, its gradual transformation into a religion also for the educated sectors of the population. Thus, when we look at the history of theology in the Holy Land under the heading 'intellectuals and Church Fathers', we can raise the following question as a first guideline for our investigation: When and by means of which figures did Christianity in that area — originally not a religion of especially educated people — seep into the educated sectors of the population? And, most of all, *how* did 'intellectuals' shape the character of Christianity?

The second term in our title, 'Church Fathers', leads to a very different type of reflection than that of the sociology of education. I will not give a detailed history of the term *ekklesiastikós patér* in the framework of the present article;⁵ I only would like to point to the fact that in a letter to Origen — according to the account of Eusebius — Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, called the Alexandrian theologians Pantaenus and Clement his 'fathers'.⁶ Eusebius himself reproached the strict Nicene Marcellus of Ancyra for attacking all the 'church fathers' when fighting against Origen.⁷ As is well known, originally certain admired theologians and bishops were honoured with the title Church Fathers. In our own days we are more familiar with the specific usage of the term that

ed. by A. Altmann, Ph. W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies: Texts and Studies, 1 (Cambridge, MA, 1963), pp. 123–41.

⁵ Cf. for an outline, J. Quasten, *Patrology*, 1: *The Beginnings of Patristic Literature* (Westminster, MD, and Utrecht, 1950; repr. Washington, 1983), pp. 9–12; B. Altaner and A. Stuiber, *Patrologie: Leben, Schriften und Lehre der Kirchenväter*, 3rd edn (Freiburg, 1978). See now C. Marksches, 'Norminierungen durch "Väter" bei Neuplatonikern und Christen', in *Zwischen Altertumswissenschaft und Theologie: Zur Relevanz der Patristik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. by C. Marksches (Leuven, 2002), pp. 1–30, and T. Graumann, *Die Kirche der Väter: Vätertheologie und Väterbeweis in den Kirchen des Ostens bis zum Konzil von Ephesus (431)*, Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie, 118 (Tübingen, 2002).

⁶ Eusebius, *HE* 6.14, 9: *patéres gár ismen* (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. by E. Schwartz, GCS Eusebius Werke, 2 (Leipzig, 1908; Berlin 1999), p. 552, ll. 3–4); to the prehistory of this usage belong passages such as *MPol* 12, 2; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.41, 2 (Irénee de Lyon, *Contre les hérésies*, ed. by A. Rousseau and others, SC 100/2 (Paris, 1965), pp. 984–97) and Clement, *Stromata* 1.1.3 (Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* 1–VI, ed. by O. Stählin, L. Früchtel, and U. Treu, GCS Clemens Alexandrinus, 2 (Berlin, 1985), p. 3, ll. 16–19).

⁷ Eusebius, *Marcell* 1.4 (Eusebius, *Contra Marcellum, de ecclesiastica theologia*, ed. by E. Klostermann and G. C. Hansen, GCS Eusebius Werke, 4 (Leipzig, 1906; repr. Berlin, 1991³), p. 18, ll. 8–12).

goes back to an energetic opponent of Eusebius, Athanasius of Alexandria. It is that bishop who, together with Basil and other theologians of the fourth century, is responsible for the organic connection that has existed since then between the expression *πατέρες* and the Nicene orthodoxy which was being established at that time: above all the participants of the Council of Nicaea are to be honored with the title 'fathers'.⁸ And it is sufficient to mention the name of the bishop of Caesarea, Eusebius, in order to call to mind the trivial fact that by no means were all the very learned and highly honoured intellectuals in the light of Nicene orthodoxy regarded as Church Fathers. On the contrary: with his writings, the valiant Alexandrian bishop Athanasius made the name of his learned colleague from Caesarea a synonym for highly problematic, if not heretical, theology nearly up to our own day; he never uses the expression *hoi peri Eusebeïou* with a positive connotation. Those observations lead us to a second key question: How, in the light of a developing Nicene orthodoxy, were the learned Christian theologians of Palestine received?

The structure of this article results from the two key questions mentioned and from the restrictions of the topic. In the first section I will ask who could be considered as belonging in such a history of ancient Christian intellectuals. In the second section I will deal with the fate of such intellectuals under the conditions of an orthodoxy that was in the process of establishing itself in the fourth century. Julius Africanus, Origen, and Eusebius of Caesarea will be taken as examples. Since the learned exegete and sharp polemicist Jerome leaves us with enough material for another presentation, he will not be considered here. I have limited my considerations up to the middle of the fourth century.

⁸ Athanasius, *Epistula encyclica* 1 (*Athanasius Werke*, ed. by H.-G. Opitz, II, 1–3 (Berlin, 1935–41), p. 170, l. 13); Athanasius, *De synodis* 6 (ibid., p. 234, l. 27); *Fidei formula synodi Sirmiensis* (*Symb. Sirm.*) 3 = Athanasius, *De synodis* 8 (ibid., p. 236, l. 10); Basilus, *Ep.* 52, 1 (Saint Basile, *Lettres*, I, CUFr, 1 (Paris, 1957), p. 134, l. 18); the distinction becomes systematic in Hieronymus, *Vir. ill.*, prol. (Hieronymus, *Liber de viris inlustribus*, ed. by E. C. Richardson, TUGAL, 14, no. 1 (Leipzig, 1896), pp. 1–56) and Hieronymus, *Ep.* 113, 3. Already the author of Ps.-Did., *Trin.* 3.22, testifies to this usage: *tis tôn en hagíos patéron edidaxen* (*Basíleios en ónoma autó*) (PG 39, 920b). The often-cited passage from Dionysius Alexandrinus, *Fr. in Lc.* 22.44 (PG 10, 1593c), is certainly not authentic (for CPG I, 1586 (p. 196), cf. W. A. Bienert, *Dionysius von Alexandrien: Zur Frage des Origenismus im dritten Jahrhundert*, PTS, 21 (Berlin, 1978), pp. 40–43).

'Intellectuals and Church Fathers': Toward an Inventory

Any attempt to draw up an inventory of those Christian theologians in Palestine who, in the sense of last century's terminology, could be called 'intellectuals', meets with difficulties. To the very present there exists no history of ancient literature that concentrates on Palestine; in fact, for quite some time there has been no attempt made at writing a work on the history of ancient Christian literature that could be compared to the scope and importance of Harnack's instructive work. The following provisional list of Christian 'intellectuals' in Palestine shows the bias of the sources upon which it is based. The main source for the early history of the Church in Palestine is Eusebius's Church history and, as is well known, any use of Eusebius implies a certain concentration on the bishops of one region. Thus, as far as Palestine is concerned, the list of bishops of Jerusalem forms the central framework of Eusebius's account. Certainly, the author himself was bound to admit how poor was his fundamental information: 'I could not discover any written information on the years of the bishops in Jerusalem'.⁹

Despite the scant sources, one can yet reasonably assume that Christianity in Palestine was not likely to have been characterized by 'intellectuals' at the transition from the first to the second century. (This, of course, leaves out of consideration the unique figure of Luke, the very learned author of the Third Gospel. It is, however, difficult to tell whether his knowledge of Palestine's geography, at times precise, was simply due to a longer stay in that area.)¹⁰ Even if the intriguing story of Jesus's relatives appearing before Emperor Domitian, reported by Eusebius,¹¹ is nothing but a legend, one can still assume, based on that story, that it was fishermen, tax collectors, and farmers on medium-sized farms who characterized the new religion's believers, and not rhetoricians and civil servants. Eusebius informs us very precisely of the size of the field of Jesus's relatives (thirty-nine acres) and he also reports that they showed their hands to the emperor: 'And it showed by the hardness of their bodies and the callus that formed on their hands due to their strenuous labour that they were manual

⁹ Eus., *HE* 4.5, 1 (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. by E. Schwartz and T. Mommsen, GCS Eusebius Werke, 2/1 (Leipzig, 1903; Berlin, 1999²), p. 304, ll. 12–13).

¹⁰ Cf. M. Hengel, 'Der Historiker Lukas und die Geographie Palästinas in der Apostelgeschichte', *ZDPV*, 99 (1983), 147–83 (pp. 182–83).

¹¹ Eus., *HE* 3.20, 1–7 (GCS Eusebius 2/1, pp. 232. l. 18–234, l. 20).

workers'.¹² Christianity in these early times carried a local stamp and consisted mainly of born Jews. Eusebius confirms this indirectly by stating several times that the names on his list of Jerusalem bishops were all Hebrew ones,¹³ and in a few places he even notes this explicitly.¹⁴

In view of this character of Palestinian Christianity, it is not surprising that the first 'intellectuals' we know of among the Christian theologians in Palestine, Sextus Julius Africanus and Origen, obviously had immigrated to and had not grown up in the region. If we can rely on the passage in the *Suda*, Julius Africanus was originally from Libya¹⁵ and only later in his life did he settle in the Roman military colony of Emmaus/Nikopolis, perhaps after a longer stay in Jerusalem.¹⁶ According to Heinrich Gelzer's convincing observations, this Christian polymath lived in the colony as a military veteran from the beginning of the twenties of the third century onward.¹⁷ Origen came to Caesarea voluntarily — as Richard P. C. Hanson has proven some time ago — in AD 233 at the age of forty-five, and he had not at all been 'banished' from Alexandria — contrary to what is sometimes written.¹⁸ We know too little of the life and work

¹² Eus. *HE*, 3.20, 3 (GCS Eusebius 2/1, p. 234, ll. 5–8).

¹³ Eus., *HE* 4.5, 2–4 (GCS Eusebius 2/1, pp. 304, l. 14–306, l. 5): *hoi pántes ek peritomés* (306, ll. 4–5.); see also 3.35 (p. 274, ll. 9–12; zu Justus), 3.11 (p. 228, ll. 2–6; zu Symeon).

¹⁴ Eus., *HE*, 4.5, 2: *hoús pántoas Hebraíous fasín óntas anékathen* (p. 304, ll. 16–17).

¹⁵ *Suda* s.v. 'Africanus': *Afrikanós, ho Sékstos chrematísas, filósophos, Libýs* (*Suidae Lexicon*, ed. by A. Adler, pars. 1, A–B, Lexicographi Graeci 1/1 (Leipzig, 1928), p. 433, l. 30).

¹⁶ Since a fragment of the final passage in Book XVIII of the *kestoi/Cesti* identifies Jerusalem as his home town (cited in: C. Marksches, 'Stadt und Land: Beobachtungen zur Ausbreitung und Inkulturation des Christentums in Palästina', in *Römische Reichsreligion und Provinzialreligion*, ed. by H. Cancik and J. Rüpke (Tübingen, 1997), pp. 265–98 (p. 280, n. 78)), one may harmonize the two statements in this way. (Certainly, this interpretation of the evidence corrects my standpoint in the paper cited above.)

¹⁷ H. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, I: *Die Chronographie des Julius Africanus* (Leipzig, 1898; repr. New York, 1973), p. 9.

¹⁸ R. P. C. Hanson, 'Was Origen Banished from Alexandria?' in *International Conference on Patristic Studies*, ed. by E. A. Livingstone, *Studia Patristica*, 17, no. 2 (Leuven, 1982), pp. 904–06. Hanson demonstrates that neither in Eusebius's nor in Jerome's writings (*Ep.* 33.5; 84.10–12, or *Vir. ill.* 54) is banishment mentioned and further, that banishment was legally impossible, as the example of the Antiochian bishop Paul of Samosata shows (p. 905). Therefore, the remarks in *Bibl. cod.* 118 (Photius, *Bibliothèque*, ed. by R. Henry, 8 vols, CUFr, 2 (Paris, 1960), II, 90–92 must be read cautiously. Origen himself mentions the events in his Commentary on John (*Jo.* 6.8; *Commentarius in Iohannem*, ed. by E. Preuschen, GCS Origenes Werke, 4 (Leipzig, 1903), p. 107, ll. 24–29).

of Ariston of Pella, who composed a dispute in dialogue form between a Jew and a Christian in the second century even before Justin, and consequently we cannot come up with much more than questions. It is not even clear where the apologist lived and worked, and consequently we cannot call him the first 'intellectual' among the Christian theologians of this area.¹⁹ It does not seem to be pure chance that Justin, who was born in Flavia Neapolis (Nablus), did not study in Palestine but in Asia Minor, and that he did not settle in his native country but in the capital city of the empire, Rome, as a freelance teacher and author. The intellectual climate of the Christian communities in Palestine obviously was not apt to such an existence.

Many other reports sustain the observation that an inventory of very learned Christian theologians in Palestine cannot begin earlier than the third century. Even though during the debate about the date of Easter in the nineties of the second century a Palestinian synod had been held under the leadership of the bishops Theophilus of Caesarea and Narcissus of Jerusalem,²⁰ which means one can assume that the Church had then been structured according to the concept of the monepiscopate, it was only Bishop Alexander (who supported Origen and was taken into custody in his old age during the persecution of Decius)²¹ who established a library in Jerusalem that would be good enough for Eusebius to consult some hundred years later for his investigations.²² It is not only from his establishment of a library and from his commitment to Origen that one can detect that Bishop Alexander had a wide range of interests and indeed was a learned person — he was also, according to Jerome, the author of the treatise *Pro Origene contra Demetrium*.²³ But it is also from the specific holdings of his library that we can gather clues to Alexander's learning. Dominique Barthélemy has tried to show that Alexander had ordered an edition of Philo's works for his

¹⁹ A. v. Harnack, 'Aristo von Pella', in *RE*, II (Leipzig, 1897), 47–48; J. Wehnert, 'Aristo von Pella', in *RGK*, 4th edn, 6 vols (Tübingen, 1998–2003), I, 728. But it is highly questionable whether the content of Eusebius's report in *HE* 4.6, 3 was a part of the lost 'Dialog' (as Harnack supposes, p. 47) or of another work.

²⁰ Eus., *HE* 5.23, 3 (GCS Eusebius 2/1, p. 488, ll. 22–25); concerning the synode cf. now J. A. Fischer and A. Lumpe, *Die Synoden von den Anfängen bis zum Vorabend des Nicaenums*, Konziliengeschichte, Reihe A: Darstellungen (Paderborn, 1997), pp. 69–71.

²¹ Eus., *HE* 6.39, 2 (GCS Eusebius 2/2, p. 594, ll. 4–10).

²² Eus., *HE* 6.20, 1 (GCS Eusebius 2/2, p. 566, ll. 5–10) and now A. Carraker, *The Library of Eusebius of Palestine*, SVigChr, 67 (Leiden, 2003), pp. 69–74.

²³ Hier., *Vir. ill.*, 62, p. 36, l. 20.

library from Origen in Caesarea, of which traces still can be found today in certain deviations from the main tradition of the text.²⁴

Whereas to the best of our knowledge Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, represented this new highly educated group of Christians and, like Julius Africanus and Origen, originally was not from the countryside of Palestine but from Jerusalem, his direct predecessor Narcissus was portrayed by Eusebius as a miracle worker who, discontented with his own community, withdrew into the desert.²⁵ Finally, the theory presented here is further sustained by the fact that in the late sixties of the third century Bishop Theotecnus of Caesarea, the second successor of Origen's friend Theoctistus, was forced to choose the Alexandrian scholar Anatolius as his successor,²⁶ because there were neither theologians whom educated Origen or any other people deemed worthy of being bishop to be found among the local clergy.²⁷ Unfortunately, highly educated Anatolius, designated as successor by Theotecnus, was wooed away by a different community while on a business trip to Antioch.²⁸ Anatolius then presided over the church in Laodicea, Syria, and the community in Caesarea was left with Agapius, a poorly educated theologian mainly concerned with effective social welfare. It was only under his successor, the well-known Pamphilus, and his later successor Eusebius that the intellectual standard of the predecessors could be resumed.

²⁴ D. Barthélemy, 'Est-ce Hoshaya Rabba qui censura le "Commentaire Allégorique"? À partir des retouches faites citations bibliques, étude sur la tradition textuelle du Commentaire Allégorique de Philon', in *Philon d'Alexandrie, Lyon 11-15 Septembre 1966*, Colloques nationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (Paris, 1967), pp. 45-78, cited approvingly in D. T. Runia, 'Caesarea Maritima and the Survival of Hellenistic-Jewish Literature', in *Caesarea Maritima: A Retrospective after Two Millennia*, ed. by A. Raban and K. G. Holum, DMOA, 21 (Leiden, 1996), pp. 476-95 (pp. 493-94).

²⁵ Eusebius, *HE* 6.9, 1-8 (GCS Eusebius 2/2, pp. 538, l. 2-540, l. 11); concerning the withdrawal, which is certainly described against the background of the fourth-century monastic movement, cf. 9, 6 (p. 538, ll. 26-29).

²⁶ Cf. the outline of his education provided by Eus., *HE* 7.32, 6 (GCS Eusebius 2/2, p. 718, ll. 14-21).

²⁷ For this interpretation, cf. Eus., *HE* 7.14: (The successor to Theoctistes, Domnus,) *brachei dé chróno toutou diagenoménu, ho kath'hemás, diádochos, kathístatai tes d'Origénous diatribes kai hoútos en* (GCS Eusebius 2/2, p. 668, ll. 6-8); 'lived for a short time and was succeeded by our contemporary Theotecnus, who also belonged to the school of Origen'.

²⁸ Eus., *HE* 7.32, 21 (GCS Eusebius 2/2, p. 726, ll. 8-14).

With regard to the state of tradition, and perhaps because of their Semitic names, something similar can be said about the Jerusalem bishops of that time, Mazabanes, who succeeded Alexander, and Zabdas.²⁹ However, in order to be able to judge the intellectual abilities of Hymenaeus, who had been bishop between the two, we would have to pay closer attention to the difficult question of the authenticity of the tradition of the trial against Paul of Samosata.³⁰ As we said, it is striking that the intellectual profile of the Church in Palestine in the third century was mainly formed by foreigners and that it was only very gradually that a genuine Christian intellectual culture developed.

The importance of Origen and the school he established³¹ can hardly be overestimated for the intellectual development of Palestinian Christianity. Even though there had long before been a stimulating atmosphere in the port and capital of the province³² — for example, a philosopher is cited in an inscription of the third century³³ — it must be doubted whether it had any influence on

²⁹ Mazabanes: Eus., *HE* 6.39, 3 (GCS Eusebius 2/2, p. 594, l. 12), 7.5, 1 (p. 638, l. 19), and 7.14 (p. 668, l. 9); Zabdas: 7.32, 29 (p. 728, l. 26).

³⁰ See now P. Navascués, *Pablo de Samosata y sus adversarios. Estudio histórico-teológico del Cristianismo antiguo en el s.III*, *Studia ephemeridis 'Augustinianum'*, 87 (Roma, 2004), pp. 29–32 and 99–102.

³¹ Concerning this question see now the well-balanced statement by H. Lapin, 'Jewish and Christian Academies in Roman Palestine: some Preliminary Observations', in *Caesarea Maritima* (see note 24, above), p. 500: 'First, with regard to the Christian 'academy' of Caesarea, it is not clear that there was any one such thing. To be sure, the involvement of both Eusebius and Pamphilus in the defense of Origen, the considerable laudatory attention Eusebius pays to both Origen and Pamphilus, and, most significantly, the maintenance of Origen's library and his letters bespeak something approaching institutional continuity'. Cf. also C. Marksches, 'Lehrer, Schüler, Schule: Zur Bedeutung einer Institution für das antike Christentum', in *Religiöse Vereine in der römischen Antike*, ed. by U. Egelhaaf-Gaiser and others, *STAC*, 13 (Tübingen, 2002), pp. 97–120.

³² H. Bietenhard, *Caesarea, Origenes und die Juden*, Franz Delitzsch-Vorlesungen 1972 (Stuttgart, 1974); see now J. A. McGuckin, 'Caesarea Maritima as Origen Knew It', in *Origeniana Quinta: Papers of the 5th International Origen Congress, Boston College, 14–18 August 1989*, ed. by R. J. Daley, *BETHL*, 105 (Löwen, 1992), pp. 3–25; *Caesarea Maritima: A Retrospective* (see note 24, above).

³³ H. Lapin, 'Jewish and Christian Academies', points to the inscriptions nos 3 and 12 in the catalogue by C. M. Lehmann and K. G. Holum, *The Greek and Latin Inscriptions of Caesarea Maritima*, Joint Expedition to Caesarea Maritima, Excavation Reports, 5 (Boston, 2000), pp. 36–38 and 47–48. It concerns the following inscriptions (as I have been kindly told by Kenneth G. Holum, University of Maryland, in a correspondence from 16 September 1999): (i) an inscription on a granite column (after 101/02 CE; cf. K. Zangemeister, 'Inscript der

local Christianity before the times of Origen. A famous anecdote suggests rather the opposite: Porphyry was said to have been beaten up by local Christians³⁴ — something which indeed does not speak well for a very high intellectual standard in the theological debates in Caesarea.

In order to understand the comparatively slow pace of this development — slow in comparison with ancient Christianity in other regions — one must take into account two things: First, that, unlike its sister churches in Egypt or Italy, Palestine Christianity did not have such a vivid intellectual centre such as Alexandria or Rome as a religious centre. On the contrary, its true centre, Jerusalem, had been destroyed twice and, as a consequence, its community was dispersed. Second, it cannot be concluded from the enormous intellectual influence which Origen's school exerted that Origen must have had a large number of pupils; the head of the school was preaching in private houses before some thirty people, something which allows us to draw conclusions as to the dimensions of his school.³⁵ The theologically interesting debates with other Christian intellectuals in which Origen intervened at the request of bishops do not take place in Palestine, but in Arabia; consider the synod against Beryllus in Bostra and that against the Thnetopsychites, both held between the years 238

Vespasianischen Colonie Caesarea in Palästina', *ZDPV*, 13 (1890), 26): '*M(arcum) Fl(avium) Agrippam pontif(icem) | Il viral(em) col(oniae) (primae) Fl(aviae) Aug(ustae) Caesareae ora|torem ex dec(reto) dec(urionum) pec(unia) publ(ica)*'. The title *orator* is explained by Zangemeister as *legatus* (pp. 28–29); (2) an Inscription on a column stemming from the 'Promontory Palace' (after 71 CE; cf. B. Burrell, 'Two Inscribed Columns from Caesarea Maritima', *ZPE*, 99 (1993), 291): *T(iton) Fl(áouion) Máximón | filósofón | Ouários Séleukos | kourátor ploíon | kol(onías) Kaisarías | tón prostáten*; 'Varius Seleukos, curator of ships of the colony of Caesarea (honors his) patron, Titus Flavius Maximus, Philosopher'; the editor points, among other things, to a philosopher of the same name (A. Stein, 'Flavius 133', in *RE*, VI/2 (Stuttgart, 1909), col. 2606) and supposes that Varius functioned as 'harbormaster'.

³⁴ Socr., *HE* 3.23, 38 (Sokrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. by G. C. Hansen, GCS, n.s. 1 (Berlin, 1995), p. 222, ll. 25–27); following A. v. Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, 4th edn (Leipzig, 1924; repr. Wiesbaden, 1980), p. 640, n. 2 (this information goes back to Eusebius). W. Kinzig, 'War der Neuplatoniker Porphyrius ursprünglich Christ?' in *Mausopolos Stephanos: Festschrift für Herwig Görgemanns*, ed. by M. Baumbach and others (Heidelberg, 1998), pp. 320–32.

³⁵ Cf. Origen, *Hom. 12, 2 in Ex. (Homilien zum Hexateuch)*, ed. by W. A. Baehrens, GCS Origenes Werke, 6, GCS, 29 (Leipzig, 1920), p. 264, ll. 6–8); A. Monaci Castagno, *Origene predicatore e il suo pubblico* (Mailand, 1987), pp. 81–93; and C. Marksches, "... für die Gemeinde im Grossen und Ganzen nicht geeignet ..."? Erwägungen zu Absicht und Wirkungen der Predigten des Origenes', *ZThK*, 94 (1997), 39–68.

and 244.³⁶ In his own town it seemed to have been mainly rabbinic scholars who challenged Origen: consider his contact with Rabbi Hoshaya, for example.³⁷

Before beginning the second section that, as noted, shall examine how those highly educated Christian theologians of Palestine were viewed in the light of a developing Nicene orthodoxy, the question should be posed, very briefly, whether the picture just drawn would change appreciably if one changed the focus of examination. Would we get a different picture if we focused on the groups which were later singled out as being heretical instead of on the tradition of the mainstream Church? According to Hegesippus, a Roman contemporary of Justin,³⁸ the heresies had their origin in the same country as Christianity itself. He names the four originally heretical teachers Simon, Kleobius, Dositheus, and Gorthaeus.³⁹ Hypothetically, we could ask whether *they* were the first intellectuals of Palestine Christianity. But a thorough study of Simon, Kleobius, Dositheus, and Gorthaeus would show that we have enough information on them to state that they were in no way superior to the educational and intellectual level of Palestinian Christianity of their time in any specific way. They simply cannot be compared with highly educated Gnostic teachers such as Basilides or Ptolemy.⁴⁰

When mentioning such names, one is bound to ask questions about the Gnostic groups of the second or third centuries. Unfortunately, what Guy Stroumsa stressed some time ago as the result of his thorough survey of the literature also holds true for these groups: 'Literary evidence about Gnostic movements in 2nd and 3rd century Palestine is very scant'.⁴¹ In order to broaden

³⁶ Fischer and Lumpe, *Die Synoden*, pp. 132–35 and pp. 135–41.

³⁷ N. de Lange, *Origen and the Jews: Studies in Jewish-Christian Relations in Third-Century Palestine*, UCOP, 25 (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 25–28, calls for caution in the evaluation of these contacts; more optimistic is Barthélemy, 'Est-ce Hoshaya Rabba'.

³⁸ Cf. C. Weizsäcker, 'Hegesippus', in *RE*, VII (Leipzig, 1899), 531–35. Pointing to Eus., *HE* 4.22, 1/2, Weizsäcker writes: 'Auf einen Wohnort im Orient werden wir dadurch gewiesen, daß er zur See nach Rom reist und unterwegs in Korinth einkehrt'.

³⁹ Eus., *HE* 4.22, 5 (GCS Eusebius 2/1, p. 370, ll. 15–17).

⁴⁰ For a first orientation see A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums, urkundlich dargestellt* (Leipzig, 1884; repr. Darmstadt, 1966), pp. 155–61; G. Salmon, 'Cleobius, Cleobians', in *A Dictionary of Christian Biography*, ed. by W. Smith and H. Wace, 4 vols (London, 1877–87; repr. New York, 1984), I, 578; S. J. Isser, *The Dositheans: A Samaritan Sect in Late Antiquity*, SJLA, 17 (Leiden, 1976), and now C. Marksches, *Gnosis: An Introduction* (London, 2003), pp. 73–83.

⁴¹ G. G. Stroumsa, 'Gnostics and Manichaeans in Byzantine Palestine', in *Papers of the 1983*

this scant basis, one needs to draw conclusions indirectly from rabbinic sources about the presence of Gnostic groups, for example with the help of Alan Segal's excellent monograph.⁴² The little direct information we have, however, is hopelessly distorted due to the polemic attitude of the authors who handed it down to us. As a matter of course, Justin's remark that 'almost all Samaritans honoured' Simon Magus 'as supreme God'⁴³ does, of course, not allow the conclusion that there had been a broad acceptance of Simonian Gnosticism in Samaria. Epiphanius's remarks on Gnostic groups in the vicinity of Eleutheropolis-Beth Gubrin, which go back to the middle of the fourth century, are of more interest. As Epiphanius was born near this town and lived there in a monastery for more than twenty-five years,⁴⁴ his own pieces of information show traces of local colour and therefore merit more confidence than stories about Gnostic groups which he probably passed on too credulously. In this context, the *Archontikai*⁴⁵ are of special interest, because Epiphanius goes into greater detail in his report on their establisher and propagandist, a certain Petrus. According to the report in the *Panarion*, Petrus turned up in Eleutheropolis and later lived as a hermit in a cave near Caphar Baricha (Kafarbarik), southwest of Hebron.⁴⁶ If one pays attention to the detailed report on that system, and to how

Oxford Patristics Conference: Critica, Classica, Ascetica, Liturgica, ed. by E. A. Livingstone, *Studia Patristica*, 18/1 (Kalamazoo, 1989), pp. 273–78 (p. 274).

⁴² A. F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism*, SJLA, 25 (Leiden, 1997); thus, Stroumsa can say: 'Although this evidence has not so far been supported by archaeological finds, it is reasonable to assume a continued presence of heretical gnostic groups in Palestine up to the fourth century' (Stroumsa, 'Gnostics and Manichaeans', p. 274).

⁴³ Just., *Iapol.* 26.3: 'hos tón próton theón ekeinón homologóúntes' (*Iustini Martyris apologiae pro christianis*, ed. by M. Marcovich, PTS, 38 (Berlin, 2005), pp. 69, ll. 9–70, l. 12); M. Hengel, too, takes Justin's account that the cult has been accepted in Samaria, as 'eine maßlose Übertreibung' (Hengel, 'Der Historiker Lukas', p. 180, n. 131.)

⁴⁴ C. Marksches, 'Epiphanius [1]', in *DNP*, 16 vols (Stuttgart, 1996–2003), III, 1152–53 (with the information about his birthplace and the excursion stemming from my article on Kerinth); J. F. Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen*, PatMS, 13 (Leuven, 1988), pp. 31–43.

⁴⁵ Epiph., *Haer.* 40.1, 1 (Epiphanius, *Panarion* 34–64, ed. by K. Holl and J. Dummer, GCS Epiphanius, 2 (Leipzig, 1922; repr. Berlin, 1980²), p. 80, l. 24–90, l. 7); cf. Stroumsa, 'Gnostics and Manichaeans', pp. 273–74; H. C. Puech, 'Archontiker', in *RAC* (Stuttgart, 1950–), I, 633–43.

⁴⁶ Epiph., *Haer.* 40.1, 3; Y. Tsafir and others, *Tabula Imperii Romani: Iudaea. Palaestina. Eretz Israel in the Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine Periods* (Jerusalem, 1994), p. 98.

hard the Archontics tried to integrate, for example, essential features of the astrology of their times into their Gnostic system,⁴⁷ there can be no doubt that Petrus tried to understand his faith rationally — and therefore he too must be included in the inventory of educated Christian theologians of Palestine. But there are two things to be considered in this context: first, that text is comparatively late (from the fourth century) and so it does not influence our image of the second and early third century; and second, in comparison with texts by Julius Africanus and Origen, the question arises whether the report on the system of the Archontics in Epiphanius's texts should not be taken as an instance of a 'smattering of knowledge' — something which can be found in many Gnostic texts.

Christian Intellectuals in Palestine in the Light of Nicene Orthodoxy

The remarkable thing about the history of Christian theology in Palestine is the fact already mentioned that, in comparison with other regions in ancient Christianity, 'intellectual theologians' in the sense of 'learned theologians' turned up comparatively late and were at first mainly from other provinces of the empire. Furthermore, it is also remarkable that emerging Nicene orthodoxy did not adopt any of those theologians as Church Fathers. Two of them were even denounced as heretics par excellence. In the case of Eusebius, it is Athanasius of Alexandria and Marcellus of Ancyra — again two foreigners — who must be held responsible; but in the case of Origen it is Epiphanius, a local theologian, who must be blamed.

In the light of the emerging Nicene orthodoxy, a theologian whom one would have least expected to do so did come off well: Sextus Julius Africanus. To the best of our knowledge he is the one theologian who least meets the model of a paradigmatic Nicene theologian. Maybe the fact that since the fourth century he had always been honoured as a learned author and sometimes has also been quoted is due, first, to the variety of his *Kestoi* (embroidery), in which he discusses military tactics, medicine, care for animals, farming, and magic, and second, to his hardly suspicious chronology from the theological point of view. Eusebius devoted a separate section, in the context of Origen's biography in his Church history,⁴⁸ to Sextus Julius Africanus and called him a 'not unimportant

⁴⁷ For this issue see the brief account in Puech, pp. 641–43.

⁴⁸ Eus., *HE* 6.31, 1–3 (GCS Eusebius 2/2, pp. 584, 21–586, l. 13).

author'.⁴⁹ Scarcely one hundred years later, the Church historian Socrates names him together with Clement and Origen in one breath and confirms that he had had some knowledge in all sciences.⁵⁰ Whereas Eusebius could still consult his works in the library of Caesarea in order to excerpt from them for his *Praeparatio Evangelica*,⁵¹ Jerome obviously only knew him as the author of a world chronicle.⁵² Even the critical patriarch Photius gives a sober report about him without any polemics.⁵³ But, of course, keeping in mind the eclectic adoption of Julius Africanus, one cannot say that he had been adopted as a 'father of the Church' by emerging Nicene orthodoxy. A major part of his works had been used as a quarry in very much the same way as encyclopaedias and chronicles by pagan authors. By way of overstatement, it might be said that Julius Africanus had been adopted as an intellectual, but hardly as a Christian theologian, let alone as a biblical exegete.

Origen did not come off nearly as well. Presumably, only experts know that Origen was already being criticised by the learned representatives of Nicene orthodoxy during the disputations on the theology of Trinity immediately after the Council of Nicaea. Thus, it was not only in the quarrels that began at the end of the fourth century that he became a highly disputed theologian.⁵⁴ It is necessary to take a few steps back in order to illustrate this. It was already Marcellus of Ancyra who had clearly tried to denounce Origen as the intellectual father of Arianism in his work against Asterius of Cappadocia and Eusebius of Caesarea written between the years 330 and 337. A fragment preserved in the writings of Eusebius shows that, in Marcellus's opinion, Origen not only

⁴⁹ Eus., 1.6,2: *ouch ho tychón dé kai hoútós gégone syggrafeús* (GCS Eusebius 2/1, p. 48, ll. 12–13).

⁵⁰ Socr., *HE* 2.35, 10: (GCS Sokrates, p. 151, ll. 6–8).

⁵¹ As supposed by K. Mras in Eusebius, *Praeparatio euangelica*, ed. by K. Mras and Édouard des Places, GCS Eusebius Werke 8/1 (Berlin 1954; Berlin 1982/83), pp. lvii–lviii; K. Mras, 'Die Stellung der *Praeparatio Evangelica* des Eusebius im antiken Schrifttum', *Anzeiger der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse*, 17 (1956), 209–17, and Carriker, pp. 179–200.

⁵² Hier. *Ep.* 70.4: '*qui temporum scripsit historias*' (Hieronimus, Sophronius Eusebius, *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae* 1–70, ed. by I. Hilberg, S. Eusebii Hieronymi opera/Sophronius Eusebius Hieronymus 1, CSEL, 54 (Vienna, 1910), p. 706, l. 6).

⁵³ Photius, *Bibl. cod.* 34 (PG 103, 66c–68c = CUFr, 2 (see note 18, above), p. 19–20).

⁵⁴ G. N. Bonwetsch, 'Origenistische Streitigkeiten', in *RE*, XIV (Leipzig, 1904), pp. 489–93; R. Williams, 'Origenes/Origenismus', in *TRE*, XXV (Berlin, 1995), pp. 414–17; W. A. Bienert, 'Der Streit um Origenes', in *Einheit der Kirche in vorkonstantinischer Zeit*, ed. by F. v. Lilienfeld and A. M. Ritter, OIKONOMIA, 25, (Erlangen, 1989), pp. 93–106, 159–60.

represented the mistaken theology of the Trinity, which was said to damage God's monarchy; it was even alleged that he only held that theology of the Trinity because 'he did not want to be taught by the holy prophets and apostles' but instead relied on his own reason and philosophical opinions.⁵⁵ Marcellus regarded Arius, Asterius, and Eusebius of Caesarea as followers of Origen according to both the content and method of their theologies, and he reproached them for exactly the same reason. Even though reproach for teaching the imaginations of one's own mind and pagan philosophumena instead of pure biblical theology was a traditional topos in Christian polemics against the heretics, and even though Marcellus did not at all belong to the acknowledged and quoted theologians in the eastern part of the empire, it must be noted that his strategy of defamation had obviously been at least partly successful. Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, for example, lays down fifteen charges against Origen in his library,⁵⁶ presumably dating back to the years 360 to 400,⁵⁷ and six of those reproaches concern the theology of the Trinity and Christology in a way that again makes Origen out as the progenitor of Arianism. Furthermore, the Church historian Socrates gives evidence that the Arians, that is, mainly the Eusebians, would have referred to Origen for their heretical theology of the Trinity.⁵⁸ In view of such massive defamation, it was only of little help that a different, highly praised representative of Nicene orthodoxy, Athanasius of Alexandria, carefully tried to differentiate between Origen's tentative, hypothetical thoughts and his binding and confirming teachings, and that he insisted on the consistency of Origen's authentic teachings with Nicene

⁵⁵ Marcellus, *Frg.* 38 (Klostermann edition; see note 7, above) = 20 (Vinzent). The recent edition by Vinzent deals with the text's transmission rather conservatively. Thus, the editor reads *deutéran hypóthesn* (instead of *hypótasin*) and translates 'zweite Grundlage' (Marcellus von Ankyra, *Die Fragmente: Der Brief an Julius von Rom*, ed., annotated, and trans. by M. Vinzent, SVigChr, 39 (Leiden, 1997), pp. 20–21). Eusebius defends Origen against the accusations in *Marcell.* 19–23 (GCS Eusebius, 4, pp. 18–23).

⁵⁶ Photius, *Bibl. cod.* 117 (PG 103, 396a/b = CUFr 2, pp. 89–90).

⁵⁷ Williams, 'Origenes/Origenismus', p. 420; Dechow, pp. 255–56, regards Didymus as author of the apology, which had disproved these points. On p. 258 he dates the text to the years between 325 and 360; see also W. A. Bienert, 'Die älteste Apologie für Origenes?: Zur Frage nach dem Verhältnis zwischen Photius, cod. 117, und der Apologie des Pamphilus', in *Origeniana Quarta: Die Akten des 4. Internationalen Origenes-Kolloquiums vom 2. bis 7. September in Innsbruck*, ed. by L. Lies, IThS, 19 (Innsbruck, 1987), pp. 123–27.

⁵⁸ Socr., *HE* 4.26, 9 (GCS, Sokrates, pp. 260, l. 29–261, l. 1).

orthodoxy.⁵⁹ Those differentiations were obviously too complicated for Origen's adversaries who were seeking unambiguity. And so the arsenal for defamation to be used in the famous clash over Origen in Palestine at the end of the fourth century had already been prepared in the thirties of the same century. Seeing Origen as 'the father of all heresies' and having declared it his life's work 'to counteract the influence of Origen's *Helleniké paideta* on the church',⁶⁰ the Palestinian monk Epiphanius, who had been appointed metropolitan in Cypria, followed quite closely in Marcellus's footsteps (presumably without knowing that he did so)⁶¹ even though he had made Marcellus the subject of one of the paragraphs in his *Panarion*.⁶² As energetically as he propagated the Nicene *homoousios* as a 'bond of faith' that brings about unity, so did he oppose Origen from 376 on as the *epitomé* of all heresies and dedicated a detailed paragraph to him in his *Panarion*.⁶³ It is beyond the scope of this article to analyse in detail that paragraph which is only partially based on polemics and rumours, but also on Epiphanius's own reading of Origen.⁶⁴ The short-term effects as well as the long-term consequences of Epiphanius's actions in Jerusalem at the beginning of the nineties of the fourth century are known sufficiently and need no further illustration here.⁶⁵

But how can the energy expended by Epiphanius against Origen be explained — that energy which in the end successfully prevented Origen from becoming

⁵⁹ Ath., *Decr.* 27 (PG 25, 465b = Athanasius Werke, 2, p. 23, ll. 20–22).

⁶⁰ Bonwetsch, 'Origenistische Streitigkeiten', p. 489.

⁶¹ But it might be that he became susceptible to a Marcellian position through the encounter with Eusebius of Vercelli, a strict adherent of Nicaea (Epiph., *Haer.* 30.5, 2 and 30.12, 9 (Epiphanius, *Ancoratus und Panarion* 1–33, ed. by K. Holl, GCS Epiphanius, 1 (Leipzig, 1915), pp. 339, ll. 20–340, l. 1 and p. 348, ll. 24–27); see also Dechow, p. 37. Eusebius lived in exile in Scythopolis (Hier., *Vir. ill.* 96).

⁶² Epiph., *Haer.* 72 (Epiphanius, *Panarion* 65–80, ed. by K. Holl and J. Dummer, GCS Epiphanius, 3 (Leipzig, 1933; repr. Berlin, 1985²), pp. 255, l. 6–267, l. 20).

⁶³ Epiph., *Anc.* 6.4: *syndemós de tés pisteos homoousion légein* (GCS Epiphanius, 1, p. 12, ll. 16–17. Holl); Epiph., *Haer.* 64.4, 2 (GCS Epiphanius 2, p. 410, ll. 3–7); cf. also Epiph., *Ep. ad. Ioh. Hier.* apud Hier., *Ep.* 51.3, 3 (CSEL 54, p. 400, l. 9).

⁶⁴ As a passage in Jerome shows, one could obviously buy and take away even valuable texts written by Origen in the library of Caesarea: Hier., *Vir. ill.* 75 (concerning Origen's commentary on the Minor Prophets); cf. P. Courcelle, *Late Latin Writers and their Greek Sources* (Cambridge, MA, 1969), pp. 104–08 (p. 104).

⁶⁵ For the long-term consequences of this development, which originated from the text by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 64) cf. Dechow, pp. 391–414.

the Church Father of the New-Nicene orthodoxy? It is true that already during his lifetime Origen had been heavily disputed even in his own municipal surroundings, a fact that he openly mentions in his sermons.⁶⁶ His apologete Pamphilus also argued — as the preserved preface of his apology shows — against people who inveighed against Origen although they owed their education to him.⁶⁷ However, according to today's sober analysis of his theology of the Trinity one would expect that he could have been designated *the* Church Father of the New-Nicene synthesis of antisubordinationism and three-hypostases-theology after the council of the empire in Constantinople in 381. For could one not interpret the synthesis of the bishops' assembly — which, systematically speaking, put an end to the argument about the theology of the Trinity in the fourth century — as an attempt to synthesize two tendencies which in Origen's works had been placed side by side in a slightly erratic way? Epiphanius's zeal against Origen has often been explained by the criticism of Origen in Egyptian monasticism, with its anti-Arian emphasis, which was said to have also influenced adjoining Palestinian monasticism. But in recent years Elizabeth Clark and Jon Dechow have, with good reason, contradicted that simplistic explanation.⁶⁸ I do not wish to deal with that complicated matter in detail in the present study, but will only draw attention to one of Origen's followers in the second generation, mentioned several times previously, whose influence on the process of Origen's denunciation as a heretic, in my opinion, has often gone unnoticed by scholars — Eusebius of Caesarea. Even a work as erudite as Jon Dechow's on the arguments about Origen does not take into consideration the role which this scholar, Eusebius — who also had been for a lengthy time the leading figure of the influential majority party of the East — played in the enormous reservations that Epiphanius and many other theologians had about Origen in the light of the

⁶⁶ Or., *hom. 25 in Luc.* (PG 13, 1867 = Origenes, *Homiliae in Lucam*, ed. by M. Rauer, GCS Origenes, 9 (Leipzig, 1931; repr. Berlin, 1959²), p. 151, ll. 10–13).

⁶⁷ Pamph./Ruf., *Apol.* (Pamphile et Eusèbe de Césarée, *Apologie pour Origène suivi de Rufin d'Aquilée, Sur la falsification des livres d'Origène*, critical text, trans., and notes by R. Amacker and E. Junod, 2 vols, SC, 464 (Paris, 2002), I, 32, ll. 7–34, l. 18).

⁶⁸ E. A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*, (Princeton, 1992), pp. 86–104; Dechow, pp. 96–107; but see his statement (p. 99): 'Thus it does not seem accurate to attribute Epiphanius' anti-Origenism to the influence of Antony and the monastic leaders in northern Egypt who followed his example'. Dechow tries to show that Epiphanius testifies to a shift of emphasis in anti-Origenistic polemics 'from Antisubordinationism to Anti-Eschatology' (p. 268).

emerging Nicene orthodoxy.⁶⁹ To put it more precisely: it was Eusebius (and not Arius or Asterius) who in the end dragged Origen into the whirl of debate in the late fourth century. The theological decline of the Eusebian party was also greatly detrimental to Origen, its theologians' main source.

None of Eusebius's contemporaries could doubt that there was close theological affinity between him and Origen. Long before he became bishop in Caesarea, Eusebius adopted a public position in favour of Origen through his contributions to the apology of Pamphilus.⁷⁰ Some time ago Charles Kannengiesser mentioned, in his important paper 'Eusebius of Caesarea, Origenist', how strongly Eusebius confessed himself to be orientated toward Origen's theology. Recent detailed examinations have proven that image to be correct.⁷¹ Perhaps it was even that above-mentioned ambivalence in Origen's theology of the Trinity, and not so much his own personal wavering, that made Eusebius at first defend Arius against his local bishop, Alexander, and then sign the anti-Arian *ὁμοούσιος* of the Council of Nicaea only a little later. Be that as it may, there is no doubt that Eusebius of Caesarea must have appeared to be one of the Origenists in the eyes of any of his theologically educated contemporaries in the fourth century. But if so, it follows that Athanasius's strategy of defaming Eusebius and his followers as Arians and of seemingly exposing them as representatives of an anti-Christian theology⁷² must have had consequences for

⁶⁹ Dechow, p. 269, says in contrast: 'The apologist's defenses and the pro-Origen attitudes of others like Athanasius and the Cappadocian fathers in the matter of Origen's Trinitarian views seem to have had some effect. Origen's fourth-century supporters among the orthodox were generally sympathetic to the homoousion anyway, as the Orthodoxy of Didymus and other prominent Origenists on the Nature of the Trinity attests. Origen's theology was eventually not presumed highly vulnerable to criticism of this type'. Dechow's judgements derive from the fact that he virtually takes no account of Marcellus and Eusebius (Marcellus is mentioned only once, very briefly, on p. 115).

⁷⁰ Dechow, p. 110; and, above all, in detail, L. Perrone, 'Eusebius of Caesarea as a Christian Writer', in *Caesarea Maritima: A Retrospective* (see note 24, above) pp. 517–19.

⁷¹ C. Kannengiesser, 'Eusebius of Caesarea, Origenist', in *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, ed. by H. W. Attridge and G. Hata, StPB, 42 (Leiden, 1992), pp. 456–58; H. Strutwolf, *Die Trinitätstheologie und Christologie des Euseb von Caesarea: Eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung seiner Platonismusrezeption und Wirkungsgeschichte*, FKDG, 72 (Göttingen, 1999); and already earlier: T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA, 1981), pp. 99–101.

⁷² Cf., e.g., from 359 CE: Ath., *Syn.* 15–19 (Athanasius Werke, 2, pp. 242–246); and now, T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, MA, 1993), *passim*. Barnes demonstrates that there were also, of course, personal motives for Athanasius's theological standpoint, e.g., the role Origen had played in the Synod

Origen's image. This at least holds true from the sixties on, when Athanasius's view began to make its way into the East as well.⁷³ And so one is bound to view as a 'tragedy' that the undoubtedly most talented 'intellectual' Christian theologian in Palestine after the times of Origen was jointly responsible for the damage that was done to his admired teacher's reputation in the fourth century.

By way of conclusion, it has been shown that it is one of the peculiarities of the history of Christian theology in Palestine that, when compared to different areas in ancient Christianity, 'intellectual' theologians, which means well-educated theologians, can be found only comparatively late, and that they were all originally from other provinces in the empire. It further has been shown that one of the tragic moments in the Christian theology of this area was that none of the intellectuals of the third and early fourth centuries was adopted as a Church Father in the light of Nicene orthodoxy. On the contrary: the fall of Eusebius, Origen's highly educated follower in the third generation, also entailed Origen's demise in which his memory was temporarily in danger of being destroyed. Once more I refer to what Max Weber said: 'Intellectuals' have left their imprint in a very specific way on Palestinian Christianity, and that process can hardly be sufficiently described in terms of general theories.

I have very briefly drawn attention to a few peculiarities in the history of the Christian theology of Palestine. However, the task still remains to make further additions to these few pieces of the mosaic, whose brightness is still obscured by the denunciations of the fourth century, in order to create a much more colourful mosaic.

of Caesarea in 334, which had sat in judgement on Athanasius (pp. 23–24) and had, in the final tally, been responsible for his first exile.

⁷³ After having been generally accepted in the West — not least thanks to Marcellus; cf. the synodal letter of Serdica 342, 1,5, 2 in Hil. (*Sancti Hilarii Pictaviensis opera*, 4, ed. by A. L. Feder, *Tractatus mysteriorum. Collectanea Antiariana Parisina (Fragmenta historica) cum appendice (liber 1 ad Constantium). Liber ad Constantium Imperatorem (liber 2 ad Constantium). Hymni. Fragmenta minora. Spuria*, CSEL, 65 (Vienna, 1916; repr. New York, 1966), p. 184, ll. 5–8: Arianism as a new invention of Eusebius of Caesarea and others).